

REMARKS

Claims 1-34, 36-45, and 47-62 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 53 have been amended. No claims are cancelled or added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all claims pending in this application are respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

In response to the Examiner's objections to the drawings, a "New Sheet" of drawings is being submitted which illustrates the features the Examiner alleges were not previously illustrated in the drawings. Support for this new figure can be found in the specification at least on page 26, beginning at line 16. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. While Applicant disagrees, claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 53 have been amended in an attempt to further prosecution. As such, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-34, 36-45, 47-60 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,701,378 to Gilhuly in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,179 to Murakami. Claim 61 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gilhuly in view of Murakami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,169,911 to Wagner. Applicants traverse these rejections on the following basis.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, "enabling a user to select one or more of the fields for displaying the transmissible media content" and , presenting "a brief form that includes only user selected ones of the fields for displaying portions of the transmissible media content that

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings (APPENDIX A) provides Figures 12 which illustrates features that were described in the originally filed specification. The new sheet is meant to address the Examiner's objections, as discussed in the Remarks section of this paper. No new matter has been added.

correspond to the user selected fields.” At least these features are not taught or suggested by the combination of Gilhuly and Murakami.

Gilhuly appears to disclose a system and method for pushing information from a host system to a mobile device upon sensing a triggering event (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 11-13). A redirector program may be implemented to initiate redirection of user data items upon sensing one or more user selected triggers (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 28-32). However, Gilhuly is silent regarding the user’s ability to select fields for displaying portions of the transmissible media content of the data items. In fact, the examiner acknowledges that Gilhuly does not disclose this feature and relies on Murakami to overcome this deficiency.

Murakami appears to disclose a system and method for automatically displaying related email messages when a telephone call is placed (see Murakami at abstract). Apparently, an electronic mail system may be linked with a telephone system, enabling associated email messages to be displayed when a call is received or accepted (see Murakami at col. 2, lines 23-55). The Examiner alleges that Murakami teaches a brief form that includes only user selected ones of the fields by referencing figure 6, column 5, lines 11-17, and column 7, lines 27-32. However, neither the cited portions, nor Murakami as a whole disclose this feature.

Apparently, Murakami provides two embodiments for displaying email messages. In a first embodiment, depicted in figure 6, an electronic mail message is illustrated having a header consisting of the following fields: To, From, Date, Message ID, and Reference ID. In a second embodiment depicted in figure 8, another example of an email message is shown wherein the header includes an additional “Free-access” field. The Examiner alleges that the email message depicted in figure 8 constitutes a full form, as claimed by the present invention. However, these are two separate and distinct methods of displaying email messages. The second appears to be used for telephone systems that permit simultaneous communication among three or more parties wherein the “Free-access” field indicated whether a party other than the calling and called parties is allowed to view the mail message (see Murakami at col. 7, lines 19-32).

Furthermore, even if the email message display formats were related and one could be considered a brief form, Murakami does not teach or suggest that the fields displayed are selected by the user. Rather, the different views are generated based on the system determining whether or not, in the case of simultaneous communications between three or more parties, the third party

may view the mail message. Since neither Gilhuly nor Murakami teach or suggest every claim feature, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references for at least this reason.

Independent claims 9, 17, 25, 53, and recite features similar to claim 1. As such, these claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons provided above.

Claims 2-7, 10-16, 18-24, 26-34, 36-45, 47-52, 54-60, and 62 depend from and provide additional features to one of independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 53. Thus, these dependent claims are allowable over the cited references at least due to their dependency.

Regarding claim 61, the Examiner asserts that "Gilhuly in view of Murakami does not specifically teach the action property includes one or a Mail TO property and a Dial Phone property," and relies on Wagner to overcome this deficiency. However, even if Wagner did teach this feature, and Applicants assert that it does not, Wagner does not remedy the deficiencies of Gilhuly and Murakami set forth above. Specifically, Wagner does not disclose a brief form including only user selected fields. Thus, claim 61 is patentable over Gilhuly, Murakami, and Wagner for at least this reason.


Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Customer Number
00909

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102
703-905-2000